arXiv:1109.3025v1 [math.FA] 14 Sep 2011

$\theta-$metric spaces and extension of Banach and Caristi's fixed point theorem

Farshid Khojasteh [a,1], Sirous Moradi [b,2] and Stojan Randenvić [c,3]

[a] *Department of Mathematics, Islamic Azad University, Arak-Branch, Arak, P. O. Box: 38156-8-8349, Iran.*
[b] *Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Arak University, Arak, P. O. Box: 38156-8-8349, Iran.*
[c] *University of Belgrade, Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, Kraljice Marije 16, 11 120 Beograd, Serbia.*

Abstract

In this paper, using a more generalized inequality instead of triangle inequality, the notion of $\theta-$metric space is introduced. Some important properties of induced topology by such spaces are presented. Also, Banach and Caristi type fixed point in such spaces are proved.

Keywords: $\theta-$metric, Uniformity, Completely metrizable, Hausdorff topology, Caristi's fixed point, Banach fixed point.

2000 AMS Mathematics Subject Classification: 47H10

1. Introduction and Preliminaries

It is well known that in 1922, the Polish mathematician S. Banach [2] proved a theorem which ensures, under appropriate conditions, the existence and uniqueness of a fixed point. This theorem provides a technique for solving a variety of applied problems in mathematical science and engineering. After that, many authors have extended, generalized and improved Banach's fixed point theorem in several ways (see for example [10, 11]).

In 1976, Caristi [3] defined an order relation in a metric space by using a functional, and proved a fixed point theorem for such an ordered metric space. The order relation is defined as follows:

Lemma 1.1 *Let (X,d) be a metric space, $\varphi : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is a functional. Define the relation "$\leq$" on X by*

$$x \leq y \iff d(x,y) \leq \varphi(x) - \varphi(y)$$

Then "$\leq$" is a partial order relation on X introduced by φ and (X,d) is called an ordered metric space introduced by φ. Apparently if $x \leq y$ then $\varphi(x) \geq \varphi(y)$.

Caristi's fixed point theorem states that a mapping $T : X \to X$ has a fixed point provided that (X,d) is a complete metric space and there exists a lower semi-continuous map $\varphi : X \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$d(x,Tx) \leq \varphi(x) - \varphi(Tx), \quad for\ every\ x \in X.$$

This general fixed point theorem has found many applications in nonlinear analysis.

Many authors generalized Caristi's fixed point theorem and stated many type of it in complete metric spaces (see [1, 7]).

In 2010, Amini-Harandi [1] extended Caristi's fixed point and Takahashi minimization theorem in complete metric space via the extension of partial ordered relation which is introduced in Lemma 1.1, and introduced some applications of such results.

---

[1] Corresponding Author's E-mail address: f-khojaste@iau-arak.ac.ir(F.Khojasteh).

[2] E-mail address: s-moradi@araku.ac.ir (S.Moradi).

[3] E-mail address: sradenovic@mas.bg.ac.rs (S.Radenović);

Third author is thankful to the Ministry of Science and Technological Development of Serbia.

Preprint submitted to Elsevier *September 15, 2011*

Between the years 1975-1988, Kramosil and Michalek [9], and Grabiec [6] introduced fuzzy metric spaces and obtained some fixed point results in such spaces.

Definition 1.2 [5] A binary operation $* : [0,1] \times [0,1] \to [0,1]$ is a called continuous $t-$norm if $a * b \leq c * d$ whenever $a \leq c$ and $b \leq d$ $(a, b, c, d \in [0,1])$.

Definition 1.3 [6, 9] The 3-tuple $(X, M, *)$ is said to be a fuzzy metric space if X is an arbitrary set, $*$ is a continuous $t-$norm and $M : X \times X \times [0, +\infty) \to [0,1]$ is a mapping satisfying the following conditions:

(1) $M(x, y, 0) = 0$,

(2) $M(x, y, t) = 1$ for all $t > 0$ iff $x = y$,

(3) $M(x, y, t) = M(y, x, t)$,

(4) $M(x, y, t) * M(y, z, t) \leq M(x, z, t + s)$,

(5) $M(x, y, .) : [0, +\infty) \to [0,1]$ is left continuous,

where $x, y, z \in X$ and $t, s > 0$.

In 1997, George and Veeramani [5] stated some important topological properties of such spaces.

The main aim of this work, is to develop the new concept of spaces using a more generalized inequality instead of triangle inequality, likewise the definition of fuzzy metric spaces, and we call it $\theta-$metric space. Here $\theta : [0, +\infty) \times [0, +\infty) \to [0, +\infty)$ is the developed definition of ordinary summation in the real numbers. For some binary operations θ, such concept generalizes the well known concept of metric spaces. **The idea of defining the $\theta-$metric spaces** which will be discussed in the following is given from the concept of $t-$norm and the trace of such binary operator in the definition of fuzzy metric spaces.

2. Main Results

In this section, we introduce $\theta-$metric space and obtain some important properties of the induced topology by such spaces. The following definition and lemmas play a crucial role in our main results.

Definition 2.1. *Let $\theta : [0, +\infty) \times [0, +\infty) \to [0, +\infty)$ be a continuous mapping with respect to each variable. θ is called an $B-$action if and only if it satisfies the following conditions:*

(I) $\theta(0,0) = 0$ *and* $\theta(t, s) = \theta(s, t)$ *for all* $t, s \geq 0$,

(II) $\theta(s, t) < \theta(u, v)$ *if* $s < u$ *and* $t \leq v$ *or* $s \leq u$ *and* $t < v$,

(III) *For each* $r \in Im(\theta) - \{0\}$ *and for each* $s \in (0, r]$, *there exists* $t \in (0, r]$ *such that* $\theta(t, s) = r$, *where* $Im(\theta) = \{\theta(s, t) : s \geq 0, t \geq 0\}$,

(IV) $\theta(s, 0) \leq s$, *for all* $s > 0$.

The following example shows that the category of $B-$actions are uncountable.

Example 2.1. *Let* $\theta(t, s) = k(t + s)$, $\theta(t, s) = k(t + s + ts)$ *for each* $k \in (0,1]$, $\theta(t, s) = \frac{ts}{1+ts}$, $\theta(s, t) = \sqrt{s^2 + t^2}$, $\theta(t, s) = t + s + ts$, $\theta(t, s) = t + s + \sqrt{ts}$ *and* $\theta(t, s) = (t + s)(1 + ts)$ *are examples of $B-$actions. We denote the set of all $B-$action such θ by $\mathfrak{M}$.*

Lemma 2.1. *Let*

$$\Psi = \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} & & f \text{ is continuous, strictly increasing} \\ f : [0, +\infty) \to [0, +\infty) & : & f(0) = 0 \\ & & f(t) < t \text{ for all } t > 0. \end{array} \right\}$$

Then, there exists a correspondence between $\mathfrak{M}$ and Ψ. In other words, $\mathfrak{M}$ is an infinite set.

Proof. For each $(t, s) \in [0, +\infty) \times [0, +\infty)$ define $\theta_f(t, s) = \lambda f(t + s)$, where $\lambda \in [0,1)$ and $f \in \Psi$. It is previous that $\theta_f \in \mathfrak{M}$. Now define

$$\begin{cases} H : \Psi \to \mathfrak{M} \\ H(f) = \theta_f. \end{cases}$$

H is well-defined and injective function and the proof is completed. □

Lemma 2.2. *Let θ be a $B-$action. For each $r \in Im(\theta) - \{0\}$ and $s \in B = (0, r]$ there exists $t \in (0, r]$ such that if we define $\eta(r, s) = t$ then we can conclude the following:*

(a_1) *$\eta(0, 0) = 0$,*

(a_2) *$\theta(\eta(r, s), s) = r$ and $\theta(r, \eta(s, r)) = s$,*

(a_3) *η is continuous with respect to first variable,*

(a_4) *if $\eta(r, s) \geq 0$ then $0 \leq s \leq r$.*

Note that if $r = 0$ then by (III) of Definition 2.1, $s = t = 0$ and (a_1) concluded.

Proof. By (III) of Definition 2.1, for each $r \in Im(\theta) - \{0\}$ and for each $s \in (0, r]$, there exists $t \in (0, r]$ such that $\theta(t, s) = r$. Now define $\eta(r, s) = t$. If t, t' be two values such that $\eta(r, s) = t$ and $\eta(r, s) = t'$. If $t \neq t'$, then $t < t'$ or $t > t'$. If $t < t'$ then $r = \theta(t, s) < \theta(t', s) = r$ and this is a contradiction. For $t > t'$ we have the same argument. Thus η is well-defined.
(a_1), (a_2) and (a_4) are straightforward from (III) of Definition 2.1.
Also, (a_3) holds since if $r \in Im(\theta)$ and $\{r_n\}$ be a sequence in $Im(\theta)$ such that $r_n \to r$, then $\theta(\eta(r_n, .), .) = r_n$. Thus

$$\theta(\lim_{n\to\infty} \eta(r_n, .), .) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \theta(\eta(r_n, .), .) = r = \theta(\eta(r, .), .). \tag{2.1}$$

If $\liminf_{n\to\infty} \eta(r_n, .) > \eta(r, .)$ or $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \eta(r_n, .) < \eta(r, .)$ then by (II) of Definition 2.1 and (2.1) we conclude a contradiction. So η is continuous with respect to first variable.

□

Definition 2.2. *The function η which is found in Lemma 2.2 called $B-$inverse action of θ. We say that θ is regular if η satisfies $\eta(r, r) = 0$, for each $r > 0$. We denote the set of all regular $B-$inverse actions by $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathfrak{R}}$.*

Example 2.2. *Let $\theta(t, s) = t + s$ then $\eta(t, s) = t - s$ satisfies in all conditions of Lemma 2.2. Also, θ is regular.*

Example 2.3. *Let $\theta(t, s) = \sqrt[n]{t^n + s^n}$, then $\eta(t, s) = \sqrt[n]{t^n - s^n}$ satisfies in all conditions of Lemma 2.2. Also, θ is regular.*

Lemma 2.3. *If $a \in X$, $c \in Im(\theta)$ and $b \in [0, c]$, then $\theta(a, b) \leq c$ implies that $a \leq \eta(c, b)$.*

proof. Arguing by contradiction if $\eta(c, b) < a$ then we have

$$c = \theta(\eta(c, b), b) < \theta(a, b)$$

and this is a contradiction and this completes the proof. □

- *$\theta-$metric spaces*

In this section, we define $\theta-$metric spaces and prove that the induced topology generated by d_θ on a nonempty subset X, which denotes by τ_{d_θ}, is Hausdorff and first countable. Also, (X, d_θ) is metrizable topological space.

Definition 2.3. *Let X be a nonempty set. A mapping $d_\theta : X \times X \to [0, +\infty)$ is called a $\theta-$metric on X with respect to $B-$action $\theta \in \mathcal{M}$ if d_θ satisfies the following:*

(A1) *$d_\theta(x, y) = 0$ if and only if $x = y$,*

(A2) *$d_\theta(x, y) = d_\theta(y, x)$, for all $x, y \in X$,*

(A3) *$d_\theta(x, y) \leq \theta(d_\theta(x, z), d_\theta(z, y))$, for all $x, y, z \in X$,* *and (X, d_θ) is called a $\theta-$metric space.*

Example 2.4. *Suppose that $\theta(s,t) = s+t$. Then, the $\theta-$metric space (X, d_θ) is the metric space (X, d) with the natural definition*

Example 2.5. *Let $X = \{x, y, z\}$ and $d_\theta : X \times X \to [0, +\infty)$ defined by*

$$\begin{array}{lll} d_\theta(x,y) = 2, & d_\theta(x,z) = 6, & d_\theta(z,y) = 10, \\ d_\theta(x,x) = 0, & d_\theta(y,y) = 0, & d_\theta(z,z) = 0 \\ d_\theta(x,y) = d_\theta(y,x), & d_\theta(x,z) = d_\theta(z,x) & d_\theta(z,y) = d_\theta(z,x). \end{array} \tag{2.2}$$

Note that d_θ is not a metric on X since $d_\theta(z,y) > d_\theta(x,y) + d_\theta(x,z)$ but if we define $\theta(s,t) = s+t+st$ then (X, d_θ) is a $\theta-$metric space.

Remark 2.1. *If (X, d_θ) is a $\theta-$metric space, $\theta(s,t) = k(s+t)$, $k \in (0,1]$ then (X, d_θ) is a metric space.*
Conversely, for $\theta(s,t) = k(s+t)$, $k \in (0,1)$ we have that there exists metric space (X, d) which is not $\theta-$metric space. For example if $X = \{1,2,3\}$ and $d : X \times X \to [0, +\infty)$ defined by

$$\begin{array}{llll} d(1,2) = 1, & d(1,3) = 1, & d(2,3) = 2, & \\ d(1,1) = 0, & d(2,2) = 0, & d(3,3) = 0, & k = \frac{1}{2}. \end{array} \tag{2.3}$$

d is a metric but d is not a θ metric.

Definition 2.4. *Let (X, d_θ) be a $\theta-$metric space. We define open ball $B_{d_\theta}(x,r)$ with centre $x \in X$ and radius $r \in Im(\theta)$ as*

$$B_{d_\theta}(x,r) = \{y \in X : d_\theta(x,y) < r\}. \tag{2.4}$$

Lemma 2.4. *Every open ball is an open set.*

Proof. We show that, for each $x \in X$ and $r > 0$ and for each $y \in B_{d_\theta}(x,r)$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that,

$$B_{d_\theta}(y,\delta) \subset B_{d_\theta}(x,r). \tag{2.5}$$

By (III) of Definition 2.1, we can choose $\delta > 0$ such that $\theta(\delta, d_\theta(x,y)) = r$. Now if $z \in B_{d_\theta}(y,\delta)$, then we have

$$d_\theta(z,x) \leq \theta(d_\theta(z,y), d_\theta(y,x)) < \theta(\delta, d_\theta(y,x)) = r. \tag{2.6}$$

It means that, $z \in B_{d_\theta}(x,r)$ and (2.5) is proved. □

Lemma 2.5. *Let (X, d_θ) be a $\theta-$metric space. Define*

$$\tau_{d_\theta} = \{A \subset X : x \in A \; if \; and \; only \; if \; there \; exists \; r \in Im(\theta) \; such \; that \; B_{d_\theta}(x,r) \subset A\}. \tag{2.7}$$

Then τ_{d_θ} is a topology on X.

Lemma 2.6. *The set $\{B_{d_\theta}(x, 1/n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a local base at x and the above topology is first countable.*

Proof. For each $x \in X$ and $r > 0$, we can find $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $1/n_0 < r$. Thus $B_{d_\theta}(x, 1/n) \subset B_{d_\theta}(x,r)$. This means that, $\{B_{d_\theta}(x,1/n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a local base at x and the above topology is first countable. □

Theorem 2.1. *(X, τ_{d_θ}) is a Hausdorff topological space .*

Proof. Let x, y be two distinct points of X. Suppose that $0 < \alpha < d_\theta(x,y)$ be arbitrary. By Definition 2.1, we conclude that $\alpha \in Im(\theta)$ Therefore, there exist $r, s > 0$ such that $\theta(r,s) = \alpha$. Clearly $B_{d_\theta}(x,r) \cap B_{d_\theta}(x,s) = \emptyset$. For if there exists $z \in B_{d_\theta}(x,r) \cap B_{d_\theta}(x,s)$ then

$$\begin{array}{rcl} d_\theta(x,y) & \leq & \theta(d_\theta(x,z), d_\theta(z,y)) \\ & < & \theta(r,s) = \alpha < d_\theta(x,y) \end{array} \tag{2.8}$$

and this is a contradiction.

Theorem 2.2. *Let (X, d_θ) be a $\theta-$metric space and τ_{d_θ} be the topology induced by the $\theta-$metric. Then for a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X, $x_n \to x$ if and only if $d_\theta(x_n, x) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.*

Proof. Suppose that $x_n \to x$. Then for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, $x_n \in B_{d_\theta}(x, \varepsilon)$, for all $n \geq n_0$. Thus, $d_\theta(x_n, x) < \varepsilon$, i.e., $d_\theta(x_n, x) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. The converse is verified easily. □

Theorem 2.3. *Let (X, d_θ) be a $\theta-$metric space and $x_n \to x$, $y_n \to y$ and $x \neq y$. Then, $d_\theta(x_n, y_n) \to d_\theta(x, y)$.*

Proof. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $K > 0$ such that for all $n \geq K$

$$d_\theta(x_n, x) < \frac{1}{n} \quad \text{and} \quad d_\theta(y_n, y) < \frac{1}{n}.$$

Thus, by the continuity of θ with respect to each variable we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_\theta(x,y) &\leq \theta\Big(d_\theta(x,x_n), \theta\Big(d_\theta(x_n,y_n), d_\theta(y_n,y)\Big)\Big) \\ &< \theta\Big(\tfrac{1}{n}, \theta\Big(d_\theta(x_n,y_n), \tfrac{1}{n}\Big)\Big) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} d_\theta(x,y) &\leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \theta\Big(\tfrac{1}{n}, \theta\Big(d_\theta(x_n,y_n), \tfrac{1}{n}\Big)\Big) \\ &= \theta\Big(0, \theta\Big(\lim_{n\to\infty} d_\theta(x_n,y_n), 0\Big)\Big) \\ &\leq \lim_{n\to\infty} d_\theta(x_n,y_n) \\ &\leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \theta\Big(d_\theta(x,x_n), \theta\Big(d_\theta(x,y), d_\theta(y_n,y)\Big)\Big) \\ &\leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \theta\Big(\tfrac{1}{n}, \theta\Big(d_\theta(x,y), \tfrac{1}{n}\Big)\Big) \\ &\leq d_\theta(x,y). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $d_\theta(x_n, y_n) \to d_\theta(x, y)$. □

Lemma 2.7. *Let (X, d_θ) be a $\theta-$metric space. Let $\{x_n\}$ be a sequence in X and $x_n \to x$. Then, x is unique.*

Proof. Suppose that $x_n \to x$ and $x_n \to y$. We show that, $x = y$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $N > 0$ such that $d_\theta(x_n, x) < \frac{1}{n}$ and $d_\theta(x_n, y) < \frac{1}{n}$. By the continuity of θ we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq d_\theta(x,y) &\leq \theta(d_\theta(x_n,x), d_\theta(x_n,y)) \\ &< \theta(\tfrac{1}{n}, \tfrac{1}{n}) \to 0\ ,\ (n \to \infty). \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

It means that, $x = y$. □

Definition 2.5. *Let (X, d_θ) be a $\theta-$metric space. Then for a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X, we say that $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence if for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $N > 0$ such that for all $m \geq n \geq N$, $d_\theta(x_n, x_m) < \varepsilon$.*

Definition 2.6. *Let (X, d_θ) be a $\theta-$metric space. We say that (X, d_θ) is complete $\theta-$metric space if every Cauchy sequence $\{x_n\}$ is convergent in X.*

Lemma 2.8. *[8] A Hausdorff topological space (X, τ_{d_θ}) is metrizable if and only if it admits a compatible uniformity with a countable base.*

In the following theorem we apply the previous lemma and the concept of uniformity (see [8] for more information) to prove the metrizablity of a topological space (X, τ_{d_θ}).

Theorem 2.4. *Let (X, d_θ) be a $\theta-$metric space. Then, (X, τ_{d_θ}) is a metrizable topological space.*

Proof. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ define

$$\mathcal{U}_n = \{(x, y) \in X \times X : d_\theta(x, y) < \frac{1}{n}\} \tag{2.10}$$

We shall prove that $\{\mathcal{U}_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a base for a uniformity $\mathfrak{U}$ on X whose induced topology coincides with τ_{d_θ}.

We first note that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\{(x, x) : x \in X\} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_n, \;\; \mathcal{U}_{n+1} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_n \;\; and \;\; \mathcal{U}_n = \mathcal{U}_n^{-1}. \tag{2.11}$$

On the other hand, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there is, by the continuity of θ, an $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$m > 2n \;\; and \;\; \theta(\frac{1}{m}, \frac{1}{m}) < \frac{1}{n}. \tag{2.12}$$

Then, $\mathcal{U}_m \circ \mathcal{U}_m \subseteq \mathcal{U}_n$: Indeed, let $(x, y) \in \mathcal{U}_m$ and $(y, z) \in \mathcal{U}_m$. Thus,

$$d_\theta(x, z) \leq \theta(d_\theta(x, y), d_\theta(y, z)) < \theta(\frac{1}{m}, \frac{1}{m}) < \frac{1}{n} \tag{2.13}$$

Therefore, $(x, z) \in \mathcal{U}_n$. Hence $\{\mathcal{U}_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a base for a uniformity $\mathfrak{U}$ on X. Since for each $x \in X$ and each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{U}_n(x) = \{y \in X : d_\theta(x, y) < \frac{1}{n}\}$. We deduce from Lemma 2.8 that (X, τ_{d_θ}) is a metrizable topological space. □

Let us recall that a metrizable topological space (X, τ) is said to be completely metrizable if it admits a complete metric [4].

Theorem 2.5. *Let (X, d_θ) be a complete $\theta-$metric space. Then, (X, τ_{d_θ}) is completely metrizable.*

proof. It follows from the proof of Theorem 2.4 that $\{\mathcal{U}_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a base for a uniformity $\mathfrak{U}$ on X compatible with τ_{d_θ}, where $\mathcal{U}_n = \{(x, y) \in X \times X : d_\theta(x, y) < \frac{1}{n}\}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there exists a metric d on X whose induced uniformity coincides with $\mathfrak{U}$. We want to show that the metric d is complete. Indeed, given a Cauchy sequence $\{x_n\}$ in (X, d), we shall prove that $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in (X, d). To this end, fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Choose $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\frac{1}{k} < \varepsilon$. Then there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(x_m, x_n) \in \mathcal{U}_k$ for every $n, m \geq n_0$. Consequently, for each $n, m \geq n_0$, $d_\theta(x_n, x_m) \leq \frac{1}{k} < \varepsilon$. We have shown that $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in the complete $\theta-$metric space (X, d) and so is convergent with respect to (X, d). Thus (X, d) is a complete metric space. □

3. Two Fixed Point Theorems

In this section we introduce two fixed point theorems in $\theta-$metric spaces. First we introduce the Banach fixed point and Caristi's fixed point theorems in such spaces.

- *Banach Fixed Point Theorem*

Theorem 3.1. *Let (X, d_θ) be a complete $\theta-$metric space and $f : X \to X$ be mapping satisfies the following:*

$$d_\theta(fx, fy) \leq \alpha d_\theta(x, y) \tag{3.1}$$

for each $x, y \in X$, where $\alpha \in [0, 1)$. Then f has a unique fixed point.

Proof. Let $x_0 \in X$ and $x_{n+1} = fx_n$. We divide our proof in 3 cases:
Case(1). We claim that, $d_\theta(x_n, x_{n+1}) \to 0$.
Indeed, We have

$$\begin{aligned} d_\theta(x_{n+1}, x_n) &\leq \alpha d_\theta(x_n, x_{n-1}) \\ &\leq \alpha^2 d_\theta(x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}) \\ &\vdots \\ &\leq \alpha^n d_\theta(x_1, x_0) \to 0 \ \ , \ \ as\ (n \to \infty). \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

It means that, $d_\theta(x_n, x_{n+1}) \to 0$.
Case (2). We claim that x_n is a bounded sequence.
If $\{x_n\}$ be an unbounded sequence then, we choose the subsequence $\{n(k)\}$ such that $n(1) = 1$ and for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $n(k+1)$ is minimal in the sense that the relation

$$d_\theta(x_{n(k+1)}, x_{n(k)}) > 1 \tag{3.3}$$

dose not holds and

$$d_\theta(x_m, x_{n(k)}) \leq 1 \tag{3.4}$$

holds for all $m \in \{n(k)+1, n(k)+2, ..., n(k+1)-1\}$. So using the triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned} 1 < d_\theta(x_{n(k+1)}, x_{n(k)}) &\leq \theta(d_\theta(x_{n(k+1)}, x_{n(k+1)-1}), d_\theta(x_{n(k+1)-1}, x_{n(k)})) \\ &\leq \theta(d_\theta(x_{n(k+1)}, x_{n(k+1)-1}, 1)). \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

By taking limit from two side of (3.5) and using (II) of Definition 2.1, we have

$$d_\theta(x_{n(k+1)}, x_{n(k)}) \to 1^+ \quad as \quad (k \to +\infty). \tag{3.6}$$

Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 < d_\theta(x_{n(k+1)}, x_{n(k)}) &\leq d_\theta(x_{n(k+1)-1}, x_{n(k)-1}) \\ &\leq \theta(d_\theta(x_{n(k+1)-1}, x_{n(k)}), d_\theta(x_{n(k)}, x_{n(k)-1})) \\ &\leq \theta(1, d_\theta(x_{n(k)}, x_{n(k)-1})), \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

and this implies that

$$d_\theta(x_{n(k+1)-1}, x_{n(k)-1}) \to 1^+ \quad as \quad (k \to +\infty). \tag{3.8}$$

Since $d_\theta(x_{n(k+1)}, x_{n(k)}) \leq \alpha d_\theta(x_{n(k+1)-1}, x_{n(k)-1})$ we have $1 \leq \alpha 1$ and this is a contradiction. Thus $\{x_n\}$ is a bounded sequence.
Case (3). We claim That $\{x_n\}$ is Cauchy sequence.
Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m > n$.

$$\begin{aligned} d_\theta(x_m, x_n) &= d_\theta(fx_{m-1}, fx_{n-1}) \\ &\leq \alpha d_\theta(fx_{m-2}, fx_{n-2}) \\ &\vdots \\ &\leq \alpha^n d_\theta(fx_{m-n}, x_0)). \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

Since $\{x_n\}$ is a bounded sequence therefore, $\lim_{n,m\to\infty} d_\theta(x_m, x_n) = 0$. It means that, $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence and then convergent to $x \in X$.

$$\begin{aligned} d_\theta(x_{n+1}, fx)) &= d_\theta(fx_n, fx)) \\ &\leq \alpha d_\theta(x_n, x)) \to 0 \ \ , \ \ (n \to \infty). \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

It means that, $x_{n+1} \to fx$, i.e., $fx = x$. Also, if x, y be two fixed point for f then,

$$d_\theta(y,x) = d_\theta(fy,fx)) \leq \alpha d_\theta(y,x). \tag{3.11}$$

and this is a contradiction. This completes the proof. $\square$

- *Caristi-Type Fixed Point Theorem*

Definition 3.1. *Suppose that (X, d_θ) be a complete $\theta-$metric space and $\mathfrak{P}$ be the class of all maps $\psi : X \times X \to [0,+\infty)$ which satisfies the following conditions:*

(E_1) *there exists $\hat{x} \in X$ such that $\psi(\hat{x}, .)$ is bounded below and lower-semi continuous and $\psi(., y)$ is upper semi-continuous for each $y \in X$,*

(E_2) *$\psi(x,x) = 0$ for each $x \in X$,*

(E_3) *$\theta(\psi(x,y), \psi(y,z)) \leq \psi(x,z)$, for each $x, y, z \in X$.*

Lemma 3.1. *By the above Definition, for each $x, y, z \in X$, we have*

$$\psi(x,y) \leq \eta(\psi(x,z), \psi(y,z)). \tag{3.12}$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.3, we obtain desired result. $\square$

Example 3.1. *Let $\theta(t,s) = \frac{ts}{1+ts}$ thus $Im(\theta) = [0,1)$. Now let $\varphi : X \to R$ be a lower bounded, lower semi-continuous function and*

$$\psi(x,y) = \begin{cases} e^{\varphi(y)-\varphi(x)} & x \neq y \\ 0 & x = y \end{cases}$$

Then ψ satisfies all conditions of Definition 3.1.

Example 3.2. *Let $\theta(t,s) = \sqrt[2n+1]{t^{2n+1} + s^{2n+1}}$ thus $Im(\theta) = [0,+\infty)$. Now let $\varphi : X \to R$ be a lower bounded, lower semi-continuous function and*

$$\psi(x,y) = \sqrt[2n+1]{\varphi(y) - \varphi(x)}. \tag{3.13}$$

Then ψ satisfies all conditions of Definition 3.1. Also, $\eta(t,s) = \sqrt[2n+1]{t^{2n+1} - s^{2n+1}}$ and θ is regular.

From now to end, we assume that θ is regular(see Definition 2.2).

Lemma 3.2. *Let (X, d_θ) be a complete $\theta-$metric space and $\psi \in \mathfrak{P}$. Let $\gamma : [0,+\infty) \to [0,+\infty)$ is $\theta-$subadditive, i.e. $\gamma(\theta(x,y)) \leq \theta(\gamma(x), \gamma(y))$, for each $x, y \in [0,+\infty)$, nondecreasing continuous map such that $\gamma^{-1}\{0\} = \{0\}$. Define the order $\prec$ on X by*

$$x \prec y \iff \gamma(d_\theta(x,y)) \leq \psi(x,y), \tag{3.14}$$

for any $x, y \in X$. Then $(X, \prec)$ is a partial order set which has minimal elements.

Proof. At first we show that $(X, \prec)$ is a partial ordered set. For each $x \in X$ we have $0 = \gamma(0) = \gamma(d_\theta(x,x)) \leq \psi(x,x) = 0$. Thus, $x \prec x$. If $x \prec y$ and $y \prec x$ then $\gamma(d_\theta(x,y)) \leq \psi(x,y)$ and $\gamma(d_\theta(x,y)) \leq \psi(y,x)$. Thus we given

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(\theta(d_\theta(x,y), d_\theta(x,y)) &\leq \theta(\gamma(d_\theta(x,y)), \gamma(d_\theta(x,y))) \\ &\leq \theta(\psi(x,y), \psi(y,x)) \\ &\leq \psi(x,x) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

It means that, $x = y$. Finally, if $x \prec y$ and $y \prec z$ then $\gamma(d_\theta(x,y)) \leq \psi(x,y)$ and $\gamma(d_\theta(y,z)) \leq \psi(y,z)$. Thus we given

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(d_\theta(x,z)) &\leq \gamma(\theta(d_\theta(x,y), d_\theta(y,z))) \\ &\leq \theta(\gamma(d_\theta(x,y)), \gamma(d_\theta(y,z))) \\ &\leq \theta(\psi(x,y), \psi(y,z)) \\ &\leq \psi(x,z). \end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

It means that, $x \prec z$. Thus $(X, \prec)$ is a partial ordered set.
To show that $(X, \prec)$ has minimal elements, we show that any decreasing chain has a lower bound. Indeed, let $\{x_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\Gamma}$ be a decreasing chain, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \gamma(d_\theta(x_\alpha, x_\beta)) \\ &\leq \psi(x_\alpha, x_\beta) \\ &\leq \eta(\psi(\hat{x}, x_\beta), \psi(\hat{x}, x_\alpha)) \end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

by definition of η we have $\psi(\hat{x}, x_\alpha) \leq \psi(\hat{x}, x_\beta)$. Thus $\{\psi(\hat{x}, x_\alpha)\}_{\alpha\in\Gamma}$ is decreasing net of reals which is bounded below. Let $\{\alpha_n\}$ be an increasing sequence of elements from Γ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \psi(\hat{x}, x_{\alpha_n}) = \inf\{\psi(\hat{x}, x_\alpha) : \alpha \in \Gamma\} = \rho. \tag{3.18}$$

Then for each $m \geq n$ we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(d_\theta(x_{\alpha_n}, x_{\alpha_m})) &\leq \psi(x_{\alpha_n}, x_{\alpha_m}) \\ &\leq \eta(\psi(\hat{x}, x_{\alpha_n}), \psi(\hat{x}, x_{\alpha_m})). \end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

By taking limit from two side of (3.19), the regularity of θ and continuity of η we given

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n,m\to\infty} \gamma(d_\theta(x_{\alpha_n}, x_{\alpha_m})) &\leq \psi(x_{\alpha_n}, x_{\alpha_m}) \\ &\leq \limsup_{n,m\to\infty} \eta(\psi(\hat{x}, x_{\alpha_n}), \psi(\hat{x}, x_{\alpha_m})) \\ &\leq \eta(\rho, \rho) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

Then our assumption on γ imply that $\{x_{\alpha_n}\}$ is a Cauchy sequence and therefore converges to some $x \in X$. Since γ is continuous and $\psi(., x_{\alpha_n})$ is upper semi continuous, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(d_\theta(x, x_{\alpha_n})) &= \limsup_{m\to\infty} \gamma(d_\theta(x_{\alpha_m}, x_{\alpha_n})) \\ &\leq \limsup_{m\to\infty} \psi(x_{\alpha_m}, x_{\alpha_n}) \\ &\leq \psi(x, x_{\alpha_n}). \end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

This shows that $x \prec x_{\alpha_n}$ for all $n \geq 1$, which means that x is lower bound for $\{x_{\alpha_n}\}$. In order to see that x is also a lower bound for $\{x_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\Gamma}$, let $\beta \in \Gamma$ be such that $x_\beta \prec x_{\alpha_n}$ for all $n \geq 1$. Then for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \gamma(d_\theta(x_\beta, x_{\alpha_n})) \\ &\leq \psi(x_\beta, x_{\alpha_n}) \\ &\leq \eta(\psi(\hat{x}, x_{\alpha_n}), \psi(\hat{x}, x_\beta)). \end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

Hence for all $n \geq 1$

$$\psi(\hat{x}, x_\beta) \leq \psi(\hat{x}, x_{\alpha_n}) \tag{3.23}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\hat{x}, x_\beta) &= \inf\{\psi(\hat{x}, x_\alpha) : \alpha \in \Gamma\} \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \psi(\hat{x}, x_{\alpha_n}). \end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

Thus from (3.23) we get $\lim_{n\to\infty} x_{\alpha_n} = x_\beta$, which implies that $x_\beta = x$. Therefore, for any $\alpha \in \Gamma$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x_{\alpha_n} \prec x_\alpha$, i.e., x is a lower bound of $\{x_\alpha\}$. Zorn's lemma will therefore imply that $(X, \prec)$ has minimal elements. □

Theorem 3.2. *Let (X, d_θ) be a complete $\theta-$metric space and $\psi \in \mathfrak{P}$. Let $\gamma : [0, +\infty) \to [0, +\infty)$ be as in Lemma 3.2. Let $T : X \to X$ be a map satisfy the following*

$$\gamma(d_\theta(x, Tx)) \leq \psi(Tx, x), \tag{3.25}$$

for any $x \in X$. Then T has a fixed point.

Proof. By Lemma 3.2, $(X, \prec)$ has a minimal element say $\bar{x}$. Thus $T\bar{x} \prec \bar{x}$. It means that $T\bar{x} = \bar{x}$. □

Corollary 3.1. *Let (X, d_θ) be a complete $\theta-$metric space and $\psi \in \mathfrak{P}$. Let $\gamma : [0, +\infty) \to [0, +\infty)$ be as in Lemma 3.2. Let $T : X \to 2^X$ be a multi-valued mapping satisfy the following*

$$\gamma(d_\theta(x, y)) \leq \psi(y, x), \ for \ all \ y \in Tx. \tag{3.26}$$

Then T has an endpoint, i.e. there exists $\bar{x} \in X$ such that $T\bar{x} = \{\bar{x}\}$.

In Corollary 3.2, we can introduce many type of Caristi's fixed point theorem such as:
If we set ψ as in Example 3.2 then (3.25) has the following form

$$\gamma(d_\theta(x, Tx)) \leq \sqrt[2n+1]{\varphi(Tx) - \varphi(x)}.$$

References

[1] A. Amini-Harandi, Some generalizations of Caristi's fixed point theorem with applications to the fixed point theory of weakly contractive set-valued maps and the minimization problem, *Nonlinear Anal. (TMA)* **72** (2010), 4661–4665.

[2] S. Banach, Sur les opérations dans les ensembles abstraits et leur application aux équations intégrales, *Fundamenta Mathematicae* **3** (1922) 133-181.

[3] J. Caristi, Fixed point theorems for mappings satisfiying inwardness conditions, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **215** (1976) 241–251.

[4] R. Engelking, *General Topology, PWN-Polish Sci. Publ.*, Warsaw, 1977.

[5] A. George, P. Veeramani, On some results in fuzzy metric spaces, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* **64** (1994), 395–399.

[6] M. Grabiec, Fixed points in fuzzy metric spaces, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* **27** (1988), 385–389.

[7] M. A. Khamsi, Extension of Caristi's fixed point theorem to vector valued metric spaces, *Nonlinear Anal. (TMA)* **74** (2011) 141–145.

[8] J. L. Kelley, *General Topology*, Van Nostrand, 1955.

[9] O. Kramosil, J. Michalek, Fuzzy metric and statistical metric spaces, *Kybernetica* **11** (1975), 326–334.

[10] I. A. Rus, *Generalized Contractions and Applications*, Cluj University Press, Cluj-Napoca, 2001.

[11] I. A. Rus, A. Petruşel and G. Petruşel, *Fixed Point Theory*, Cluj University Press, Cluj-Napoca, 2008